



Forest Service
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Dakota Prairie Grasslands | April 2022

Grasslands Plan Monitoring Program

Dakota Prairie Grasslands



Cover image: Buttes of the Badlands on the Little Missouri National Grassland, North Dakota. USDA Forest Service Northern Region.

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at [How to File a Program Discrimination Complaint](#) and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

Contents

Introduction.....	5
Geology and Paleontology	5
MON-GEO-01	5
Soil Integrity	5
MON-SOIL-01	5
Aquatic	6
MON-AQU-01	6
MON-AQU-02	6
MON-AQU-03	7
MON-AQU-04	7
Botany	7
MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C.....	7
MON-BOT-02.....	8
MON-WLD-01A, -01B.....	9
MON-WLD-02A, -02B, -02C.....	9
MON-WLD-03	10
MON-WLD-04	10
MON-WLD-05	10
MON-WLD-06	11
MON-WLD-07	11
Vegetation	11
MON-NOX-01	11
MON-VEG-01	12
MON-VEG-02	12
MON-VEG-03	12
Recreation	13
MON-REC-01	13
MON-REC-02.....	13
MON-REC-03.....	13
MON-REC-04.....	14

MON-REC-05	14
Heritage	14
MON-HRT-01	14
MON-HRT-02	15
Community Relations	15
MON-CMR-01	15
MON-CMR-02	16

Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation requirements have been established through the National Forest Management Act per 36 CFR 219. Additional direction is provided by the Forest Service Handbook (1909.12), Chapter 30. The Dakota Prairie Grasslands (DPG) completed the FY2021 Biennial Monitoring Evaluation Report (BMER). During the FY2021 reporting efforts, the monitoring program was reviewed and based on evaluation of monitoring, changes were warranted per 36 CFR 219.12(d)(2). This document modifies the DPG Land and Resource Management Plan's monitoring program per specialist's recommendations in the FY2021 BMER.

*Bold and italicized indicates a change from the 2016 DPG Monitoring Program

Geology and Paleontology

MON-GEO-01

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 2.c Objective 1. Within 15 years, provide interpretation for at least 20% of important geological and paleontological sites, consistent with the conservation plans.	
Monitoring Question	<i>What is the status of providing interpretation of geological and paleontological sites?</i>
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<i>Visitor Days – Area Museums (annual)</i> <i>DPG Paleo Permits Issued – DPG SO and District Records (annual)</i> <i>Public Field Days – DPG SO Records (annual)</i> Partnerships (number and types of partnerships fostered) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)
<i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i> <i>Methodology updates: Define clearly what an interpretive site is, confirm the number of known paleontological sites the DPG has to be able to compare with the 20% stated goal in the LRMP, complete an accurate assessment of displayed or curated specimens excavated from the DPG, determine if the 20% goal in the LRMP is reasonable compared to the number of sites and the numbers specimen curated.</i>	

Soil Integrity

MON-SOIL-01

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1a Objective 1. Within 10 years, identify watershed conditions to provide baseline data sufficient to meet the following objectives: Achieve a 20% reduction in acres of eroded or disturbed soils caused by Forest Service permitted or management actions.	
Monitoring Question	To what extent have soils been disturbed and restored?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	By allotment or pasture: Similarity index (weight of plant species within dominant sites in a pasture/allotment) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)

	<p>State transition (acres of each state/transition per ecological site) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Rangeland infrastructure (acres of) – WIT, INFRA, GIS Library</p> <p>Rangeland improvements (acres and numbers of actions that contribute toward improvement) – FACTS, WIT</p> <p>Oil and gas well pad development (acres of) – DPG SO Records</p> <p>Road development (acres of) – DPG SO Records</p> <p>Reclamation (acres of reclaimed lands) – DPG SO Records</p>
--	---

Aquatic

MON-AQU-01

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 1a Objective 2. Move at least 80% of riparian areas and wood draws toward self-perpetuating plant and water communities that have desired diversity and density of understory and overstory vegetation within site capability.</p> <p>Goal 1a Objective 3. Meet or move toward Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) on at least 80% of perennial streams.</p>	
Monitoring Question	What is the condition of perennial and intermittent streams and high value spring and high value wetlands?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>17 indicators of PFC to determine:</p> <p>Miles of intermittent and perennial streams in: proper functioning condition, functioning at risk (upward, not applicable, downward), non-functioning – DPG SO Records (<i>10 year</i>)</p> <p>Acres of wetlands and springs in:</p> <p>Proper functioning condition, functioning at risk (upward, not applicable, downward), non-functioning – DPG SO Records (<i>10 year</i>)</p>

MON-AQU-02

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 1a Objective 1. Within 10 years identify watershed conditions to provide baseline data sufficient to meet the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve 20% of 6th Hydrologic Unit Code (sub-watershed) level watersheds from Class II to Class I or Class III to Class II. Maintenance of unimpaired watersheds and restoration of impaired watershed are high priorities. Utilize criteria of geomorphic integrity, water quality integrity, biotic information, watershed vulnerability, and potential partnerships to prioritize watershed improvement projects. Improve the water quality associated with 20% of degraded water bodies. 	
Monitoring Question	What is the water quality condition?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Watershed Condition Class (number of watersheds moved from one Class to a higher functioning Class) - WCATT

	<p>303d streams (miles of impaired streams) – North Dakota Department of Health (2 year), South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (2 year)</p> <p>Water quality (levels of pH, conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, chloride, sodium) – DPG SO Records (<i>specific interval not set</i>)</p>
--	--

MON-AQU-03

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 1a Objective 1. Within 10 years identify watershed conditions to provide baseline data sufficient to meet the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the water quality associated with 20% of degraded water bodies. 	
Monitoring Question	What is the effectiveness of Best Management Practices (BMPs) in preventing degradation to water bodies?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>BMPs (<i>total number of BMPs surveys</i>) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>BMP implementation ranking (sampling of total are checked for implementation) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>BMP effectiveness ranking (sampling of total are checked for effectiveness) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>BMP composite ranking (sampling of total implementation and effectiveness rankings) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p>

MON-AQU-04

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 1a Objective 5. Prevent contamination of surface water, sub-surface flows, and aquifers.</p>	
Monitoring Question	To what extent have surface, sub-surface flows, and aquifers been protected from contamination by management actions?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>Decommissioned wells (number of oil and water wells properly decommissioned) – DPG SO Records, WIT Database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Hazardous spills and clean actions (number of) – DPG SO and District Records</p> <p>BMPs (<i>total number of BMPs surveys</i>) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>BMP implementation ranking (sampling of total are checked for implementation) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>BMP effectiveness ranking (sampling of total are checked for effectiveness) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>BMP composite ranking (sampling of total implementation and effectiveness rankings) – BMP national database (<i>annual</i>)</p>

Botany

MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C

Plan Component(s) being assessed:

<p>Goal 1.b Objective 2. Within 15 years, for threatened, endangered, sensitive, and MIS, demonstrate positive trends in population viability, habitat availability, habitat quality, and population distribution within the planning area.</p> <p>Goal 1.b Objective 4. Within 15 years, conserve populations of species at risk and rare communities by demonstrating positive trends in habitat availability and quality or any other applicable factors affecting species at risk.</p> <p>Goal 1.b Objective 6. Establish scientifically credible monitoring programs, develop survey methods, and initiate baseline and trend surveys for populations, habitat, and/or ecological conditions to contribute to viability of threatened and endangered species, species at risk, and MIS.</p>			
Monitoring Question	<p>MON-BOT-01A</p> <p>What is the current population status of western prairie fringed orchid (<i>Platanthera praeclara</i>)?</p>	<p>MON-BOT-01B</p> <p>What is the current and potential habitat capability for western prairie fringed orchid?</p>	<p>MON-BOT-01C</p> <p>What management actions and naturally occurring events have influences changes to western prairie fringed orchid status and/or its habitat?</p>
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (Interval of data collection)	<p>Occurrences (<i>number of flowering stems, number of pods that set seed per flowering plant, and the number of viable seeds incorporated into the seedbank</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Surveys (<i>number of pastures and allotments surveyed for flowering orchids</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p>	<p>Potential habitat (<i>acres of</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Current habitat (<i>acres of</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p>	<p>Grazing activities (<i>acres grazed and not grazed overlapping with orchid occurrences, acres of orchid occurrences rested between 6/1-9/15 within each core allotment</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Vegetation treatments (<i>e.g. acres treated for leafy spurge within core and satellite areas, acres burned or mowed in core and satellite areas, including rested areas</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Orchid habitat in invaded state (<i>acres of</i>) – SNG Records (<i>annual</i>)</p>
<p>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</p> <p><i>Vegetation treatments and orchid populations need to be evaluated further to determine if there is a cause-and-effect relationship.</i></p>			

MON-BOT-02

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 1.b Objective 4. Within 15 years, conserve populations of species at risk and rare communities by demonstrating positive trends in habitat availability and quality or any other applicable factors affecting species at risk.</p> <p>Goal 1.b Objective 5. As rare plant and wildlife communities are identified, inventory them and develop associated management strategies to conserve them.</p> <p>Goal 1.b Objective 9. Conduct target surveys for globally rare plant species and other rare plant species with viability concerns.</p>	
Monitoring Question	What is the status of rare plants?

Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Occurrences (<i>number of stems, acres of occupancy</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual, note: not all occurrences will be visited every year. Selection of interval of visits dependent on life history of plant.</i>)
--	--

MON-WLD-01A, -01B

Plan Component(s) being assessed: same as MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C		
Monitoring Question	MON-WLD-01A What is the current black-tailed prairie dog (<i>Cynomys ludovicianus</i>) occupancy?	MON-WLD-01B What management actions and naturally occurring events have influenced change to black-tailed prairie dog status and/or its habitat?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>Prairie dog locations (<i>mapped locations and acres of prairie dogs</i>) – DPG SO Records: DPG GIS files, GRNG Allotment Management Plan Monitoring Reports, USFS yearly reports on black-footed ferret recovery prairie dog habitat management activities (3 year)</p> <p>Complexes (<i>number of complexes – collection of colonies</i>) – DPG SO Records: DPG GIS files, GRNG Allotment Management Plan Monitoring Reports, USFS yearly reports on black-footed ferret recovery prairie dog habitat management activities (3 year)</p> <p>Active colonies (<i>total acreage and number of active colonies</i>) – DPG SO Records: DPG GIS files, GRNG Allotment Management Plan Monitoring Reports, USFS yearly reports on black-footed ferret recovery prairie dog habitat management activities (3 year)</p> <p>Habitat availability (<i>acres of current prairie dog occupancy</i>) – DPG SO Records (3 year)</p>	<p>Damage control (<i>acreage of prairie dog towns controlled</i>) – SD State Wildlife Control Office (annual), ND – DPG contract reports (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Prescribed fires (<i>acres of</i>) – FACTS and District Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Vegetation exclosures (<i>number of</i>) – FACTS, District Records, GRNG Allotment Management Plan Monitoring Reports (<i>annual</i>)</p>
<p><i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i></p> <p><i>Control efforts should be evaluated to determine if efforts have had negative impacts to establishing or maintaining desired complex numbers.</i></p>		

MON-WLD-02A, -02B, -02C

Plan Component(s) being assessed: same as MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C			
Monitoring Question	MON-WLD-02A What is the current population status of 1) sage grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), 2) sharp-tailed grouse (<i>Tympanuchus phasianellus</i>), and 3) greater	MON-WLD-02B What is the current and potential habitat capability for 1) sage grouse, 2) sharp-tailed grouse, and 3) greater prairie chicken?	MON-WLD-02C What management actions and naturally occurring events have influenced change to the status and/or habitat for 1) sage grouse,

	prairie chicken (<i>Tympanuchus cupido</i>)?		2) sharp-tailed grouse, and 3) greater prairie chicken?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	By each grouse species: Leks (<i>number of</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>) Gender ratio (<i>number of males & females within each lek</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)	By each grouse species: Robel Pole/Visual obstruction readings (vegetation height & density on sites dominated by herbaceous vegetation. % of Low, Medium, High by each established monitoring block or by geographic area.) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)	By each grouse species: Habitat improvements (<i>number and acres of actions that improve habitat</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>) Annual Precipitation) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)

MON-WLD-03

Plan Component(s) being assessed: same as MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C	
Monitoring Question	What is the population and habitat status of the Dakota skipper (<i>Hesperia dacotae</i>) in high potential habitat?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Suitable habitat (<i>acres of modeled habitat determined to be suitable</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>) Occurrences (<i># of individuals</i>) – DPG SO Records: Contracts, 3 rd party contracts, Visiting Researchers (<i>annual</i>) Forage use (<i>landscape appearance protocol</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>) Oil and gas activity (<i>acres of/# of activities in Critical Habitat</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>) Habitat improvements (<i># or acres of habitat improvement actions</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)

MON-WLD-04

Plan Component(s) being assessed: same as MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C	
Monitoring Question	What is the distribution and status of Northern long-eared bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>)?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Occurrences (<i>presence/absence</i>) – DPG SO Records: Visiting Researchers, 3 rd party contractors Cooperative Agreement (<i>annual</i>)
<i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER Develop a monitoring program.</i>	

MON-WLD-05

Plan Component(s) being assessed: same as MON-BOT-01A, -01B, -01C	
Monitoring Question	What is the presence of Poweshiek skipperling (<i>Oarisma poweshiek</i>) during Dakota skipper surveys?

Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Occurrence (<i>presence/absence of Poweshiek skipperling during Dakota skipper surveys MON-WLD-03</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)
<i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i> <i>Confirmation of extirpated status, re-evaluate need for monitoring.</i>	

MON-WLD-06

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1.b Objective 2. Within 15 years, for threatened, endangered, sensitive, and MIS, demonstrate positive trends in population viability, habitat availability, habitat quality, and population distribution within the planning area. Goal 1.b Objective 4. Within 15 years, conserve populations of species at risk and rare communities by demonstrating positive trends in habitat availability and quality or any other applicable factors affecting species at risk.	
Monitoring Question	Are management actions effective in protecting golden eagle nests?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Active territory (<i>presence/absence within ½ mile following implementation</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>survey as needed, post implementation</i>)
<i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i> <i>Reevaluate indicator and monitoring plan. Monitoring efforts and indicator should be refocused on maintaining the inventory of golden eagle nests to ensure stipulations are effectively applied. Additional post-project monitoring efforts should be implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of stipulations.</i>	

MON-WLD-07

Plan Component(s) being assessed: same as MON-WLD-06	
Monitoring Question	Are management actions effective in protecting bighorn sheep lambing?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Timing restrictions of projects/permits with timing stipulations – DPG SO Records Lambing periods (<i>during year of activity</i>) – State wildlife records for lambing periods
<i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i> <i>Develop an effective indicator and adjust plan timing limitation to extend through July 15. An appropriate indicator should involve evaluating bighorn sheep populations against timing limitations at the extent of the species' location within the LMNG administrative boundary.</i>	

Vegetation

MON-NOX-01

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1.c Objective 4. Within 5 years, develop and maintain cooperative noxious weeds and invasive species management plans in consultation with appropriate partners and agencies. Goal 1.c Objective 6. Within 10 years, limit further expansion of areas affected by noxious weeds.	
---	--

Goal 1.c Objective 7. Within 10 years, implement an integrated prevention and pest control management program for noxious weeds and invasive plant species.	
Monitoring Question	To what extent has the integrated prevention and pest control management for noxious weeds been implemented?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Acres of treatment types (<i>biocontrol, herbicide cultural – sheep grazing, or other types</i>) – FACTS, treatment data (<i>annual</i>) Partners (<i>number of partners with cooperative agreements</i>) – DPG SO Records, NRM- grants and agreements (<i>annual</i>)
<i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i> <i>Develop a strategy on monitoring effects of treatments to align with Goal 1.c Objective 6- Within 10 years, limit further expansion of areas effected by noxious weeds.</i>	

MON-VEG-01

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1.c Increase the amount of forests and grasslands restored to or maintained in a healthy condition with reduced risk and damage from disturbance processes, both natural and human-controlled. Goal 2.c Improve the capability of the Nation’s forests and grasslands to provide a desired sustainable level of uses, values, products, and services.	
Monitoring Question	What is the status of rangeland conditions relative to site potential?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Similarity index and state transition: MON-SOIL-01

MON-VEG-02

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1.c Objective 1. Within 10 years, implement management practices, including prescribed fire, that will move landscapes toward desired vegetation composition and structure as described in Geographic Area direction.	
Monitoring Question	What management actions have occurred that contribute to the ability of plant communities to retain function or regain function after disturbance?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Prescribed fire (<i>acres of Rx fires that maintain or improve community function</i>) – FACTS (<i>annual</i>) Mowing (<i>acres</i>) – FACTS (<i>annual</i>) <i>Prescribed grazing – NRM, RIMS (annual)</i>

MON-VEG-03

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1.c. Increase the amount of forests and grasslands restored to or maintained in a healthy condition with reduced risk and damage from disturbance processes, both natural and human-controlled. Goal 1.a Objective 2. Move at least 80% of riparian areas and woody draws toward self-perpetuating plant and water communities that have desired diversity and density of understory and overstory vegetation within site capability.	
--	--

Monitoring Question	What is the status of woody draw condition relative to site potential?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Number woody draws in each state/transition per ecological site (<i>by project</i>) – LMNG Staff (<i>interval of visits dependent on project NEPA decision</i>)

Recreation

MON-REC-01

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 2.a Objective 1. Annually, maintain or reconstruct 20% of national grassland trails to regional standards. Goal 2.a Objective 6. Provide nonmotorized and motorized trails for a wide variety of uses and experiences.	
Monitoring Question	To what extent are trails managed to meet regional standards?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Trails maintained (<i>miles of</i>) – INFRA (<i>annual</i>) Trails improved (<i>miles of</i>) – INFRA (<i>annual</i>) Maintenance needs (<i>number of miles of needing maintenance</i>) – INFRA (<i>annual</i>) Trail regional standards (<i>miles of trails meeting and not meeting regional standards</i>) – INFRA (<i>annual</i>) Non-motorized trails (<i>miles of</i>) – INFRA (<i>annual</i>)

MON-REC-02

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 2.a. Improve the capability of the Nation's forests and grasslands to provide diverse, high-quality outdoor recreation opportunities.	
Monitoring Question	To what extent are recreational opportunities meeting public interests?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Visitor use (<i>number and type of visit</i>) – National Visitor Use Monitoring (<i>1 season every 5 years</i>) Fee collections (<i>number or amount of fees collected</i>) – Point of service sale system (POSS) Recreation use and needs – North Dakota State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) (<i>1 season every 5 years</i>) Social media hits (<i>comments and suggestions from website on how to improve or new needs</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>) Public outreach events – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)

MON-REC-03

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 1.2A. Allow uses and activities if they do not degrade wilderness characteristics.	
Monitoring Question	To what extent do management activities influence the features important to suitable wilderness (MA 1.2A)?

Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>Non-conforming uses (<i>number of permits/authorizations that are non-conforming to characteristics of suitable wilderness</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)</p> <p>Permit applications (<i>number of permit applications received/denied within the suitable wilderness</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)</p> <p>Permitted roads (<i>number of off-road permits authorized in suitable wilderness</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)</p>
--	---

MON-REC-04

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 2.c Objective 1. Implement practices that will meet, or move the landscape character toward, scenic integrity objectives consistent with Geographic Area direction.</p>	
Monitoring Question	<i>To what extent has the Unit progressed with scenic integrity objectives?</i>
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>Scenic Integrity Objectives (<i>number of projects that are moving or not moving toward SIO</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)</p> <p>Actual scenic integrity (<i>acres and location of desired versus actual scenery integrity condition</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)</p>
<p><i>Additional Monitoring Program recommendations from the FY2021 BMER</i></p> <p><i>Capacity for all program managers to provide data on projects for scenic integrity objectives</i></p>	

MON-REC-05

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Goal 4.a Objective 1. Within 5 years, identify travel opportunities and restrictions; including designating motorized travel-ways and areas, to meet land management objectives.</p> <p>Goal 4.a Objective 2. Provide reasonable access for use of the national grasslands.</p> <p>Goal 4.a Objective 4. Identify the minimum Forest Service road system for administration, utilization, and protection of national grasslands resources using a science-based roads analysis process. Provide safe and efficient travel and minimize adverse environmental effects.</p>	
Monitoring Question	To what extent is off-road vehicle use (permitted and unpermitted) damaging grassland resources and causing erosion, sedimentation, and vegetation loss?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>Unauthorized use (<i>number of and acres of incidents</i>) – DPG SO Records, opportunistic reports as observed (<i>periodically</i>)</p> <p>Cited incidents (<i>number of unpermitted incidents</i>) – LEO incident reports (<i>periodically</i>)</p> <p>Photo interpretation (<i>change in resource conditions as seen in plot points</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>periodically</i>)</p>

Heritage

MON-HRT-01

<p>Plan Component(s) being assessed:</p> <p>Legal- National Historic Preservation Act</p>

Goal 2.b Objective 2. Within 5 years, assess identified sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in conjunction with SHPO and THPO and provide interpretation for National Register of Historic Places sites where appropriate and consistent with developed preservation plans.	
Monitoring Question	Are the National Register of Historic Places sites and districts being identified and managed?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>National registered eligible sites (<i>total number of, number of new</i>) – Heritage Natural Resources Manager, INFRA, DPG SO Records (3-5 year)</p> <p>National registered properties (<i>number of listed</i>) – Heritage Natural Resources Manager, INFRA, DPG SO Records (3-5 year)</p> <p>Priority heritage asset (<i>number assessed as needing further management</i>) Heritage Natural Resources Manager, INFRA, DPG SO Records (3-5 year)</p>

MON-HRT-02

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 2.b Objective 5. In partnership with American Indian tribes and/or others, educate and interpret, to increase public awareness, protect heritage resources, and further the goals of research.	
Monitoring Question	Are tribes being consulted on sites of religious and cultural significance?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Tribal consultations (<i>number of tribal consultation visits</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual tribal relation reports</i>)

Community Relations

MON-CMR-01

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 2.c Improve the capability of the Nation's forests and grasslands to provide a desired sustainable level of uses, values, products, and services.	
Monitoring Question	What multiple use services have been provided?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	<p>Federal payments; revenue sharing with state and local governments – Headwater Economics Tool (2 year)</p> <p>AUMs (<i>number of</i>) – Grazing Statistical Report (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Oil and gas permits (<i>number of</i>) – McKenzie and Medora District Offices (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Special Use Permits (<i>number of</i>) – DPG SO Records, SUDS (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Person at One Time (PAOT) (<i>number of</i>) – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)</p> <p>Recreation/Visitor Use/Purpose of Use – National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) (5 year)</p> <p>Developed Recreation Sites Available – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)</p>

	Miles of non-motorized recreation trails available – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>) Interpretive sites available – DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)
--	--

MON-CMR-02

Plan Component(s) being assessed: Goal 4.b Objective 2. Work in cooperation with federal, state, and county agencies, individuals, and nongovernment organizations for control of noxious weeds, invasive species, and animal damage.	
Monitoring Question	To what extent is cooperation with external interested parties occurring for control of animal damage?
Indicators (<i>Measure</i>) – Data Source/Storage (<i>Interval of data collection</i>)	Damage control (<i>acreage of prairie dog towns controlled</i>) – MON-WLD-01A, -01B Damage control (<i>number and locations of damage control, by species</i>) – USDA APHIS, Wildlife Services, DPG SO Records (<i>annual</i>)